

## REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action of February 25, 2005 has been received and its contents reviewed. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the consideration given to the above-identified application.

By the above actions, claims 1, 4-9 and 17-20 have been amended, and claim 21 has been cancelled. Claims 2, 3, 10-16 and 23-24 have been withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-9, 17-21 are pending for consideration, of which claim 1 is independent.

Applicants note that the form PTOL-326 and the first line of page 3 of the Office Action mailed February 25, 2005 summarize claim 22 as withdrawn from consideration, while the detailed Office Action in Section 6, page 3 of the Office Action includes a rejection of claim 22. As remarked on page 9 of the Response to Request for Election of Species and Amendment filed November 22, 2004, elected Species I is readable on claims 1, 4-9 and 17-22. Hence, Applicants treat claim 22 as not withdrawn from consideration.

Turning now to the detailed Office Action, claims 1, 5, 6, 9 and 17-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as anticipated by Kawasaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,012 – hereafter Kawasaki). Further, claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Peter VanZant (*Microchip Fabrication* – hereafter VanZant). Still further, claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Kawasaki in view of Someya et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0080295 – hereafter Someya). Finally, claims 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Murade (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0030722). These rejections are respectfully traversed at least for the reasons provided below.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to further recite "wherein a second wiring line is formed over the channel formation region with a second insulating layer interposed therebetween; and wherein a second wiring line does not overlap the low concentration impurity region" to avoid the rejection as the attached sheet.

Applicants respectfully assert that Kawasaki discloses a semiconductor device having a pixel TFT which has a channel formation region (407) formed over a first wiring line (403)

with an insulating layer (402) interposed, and has a low concentration impurity region (406) that is in contact with the channel formation region and overlaps the first wiring line; wherein the storage capacitor is formed: from a capacitor wiring line (415), from a semiconductor region (414) that has the same composition as the channel formation region or the low concentration impurity region, and from a part of the insulating layer; and wherein the first wiring line and the capacitor wiring line are formed on the same layer in Fig. 8b. However, Kawasaki fails to teach, disclose or suggest the claimed feature "wherein a second wiring line is formed over the channel formation region with a second insulating layer interposed therebetween; and wherein a second wiring line does not overlap the low concentration impurity region", as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is clearly distinguishable from the invention of Kawasaki.

Consequently, since each and every feature of the present claim 1 is not taught (and is not inherent) in the teachings of Kawasaki, as is required by MPEP Chapter 2131 in order to establish anticipation, the rejection of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 5, 6, 9 and 17-22, under 35 U.S.C. §102(a), as anticipated by Kawasaki is improper.

With respect to the §103(a) rejections, the amendment and arguments set forth above in relation to the §102(a) rejection of independent claim 1 are also applicable. That is, as none of the cited prior art references teach, disclose or suggest the amended feature "wherein a second wiring line is formed over the channel formation region with a second insulating layer interposed therebetween; and wherein a second wiring line does not overlap the low concentration impurity region", the combination of VanZant, Murade or Someya with Kawasaki is improper.

Claim 21 has been cancelled, as all the features of cancelled claim 21 have been incorporated into claim 1. Claims 4-9 and 17-20 have been amended to change their dependency to claim 1.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all the pending rejections.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise, which could be eliminated through discussions with Applicants' representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that the further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Luan C. Do

Registration No. 38,434

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
Suite 900, 401 9<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128  
(202) 585-8000